

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to an outstanding Office Action dated May 20, 2004, the shortened statutory period for response set to expire on August 20, 2004. Accordingly, a Petition and Fee for Extension of Time are included herewith.

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-34 are pending in this application. The Examiner rejected all 34 pending claims in the Office action mailed on May 20, 3004. Applicants hereby amend claims 1, 2, 5-7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 22, 24-26, 28, 30-32, and 34 as indicated above to correct matters of grammar or form and/or to further clarify the claimed invention. Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 28, and 34 are independent claims.

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's citation of statutory authority as the basis for the claim rejections.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-22, 24-28, and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,325,393 ("Barrett") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,694,618 ("Hibino"). In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 23 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett in view of Hibino and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,371 ("Kumpf").

With regard to claim 1, the claim as amended is directed to an information processing apparatus capable of acquiring various status information of plural peripheral apparatus on a network, comprising among other things, memory means for memorizing a time-out parameter that indicates a time-out time for executing said communication protocol for each phenomenon that can be designated by said designation means, link means for linking, by the

unit of a predetermined group, parameters respectively corresponding to the objects and memorized by said memory means, alteration means for altering the value of the parameter memorized by said memory means, and control means adapted, in case the value of the parameter is altered by said alteration means, to alter the value of a parameter linked with the altered parameter as a group according to the content of such alteration.

The Examiner states that Barrett does not teach the acquisition, memory, link and alteration means of claim 1, but that Hibino does. (May 20, 2004 Office Action at ¶ 6). Applicant, however, respectfully submits that Hibino does not disclose or suggest any of these means. First, even though Hibino discloses a printer setting device that allows an operator to select and set several desired printer settings while viewing them on a display, Hibino does not teach at all a time-out parameter, especially one that indicates a time-out time for executing a communication protocol. Hence Hibino does not teach a “memory means for memorizing a time-out parameter that indicates a time-out time for executing said communication protocol for each phenomenon that can be designated by said designation means” as recited in claim 1. For this reason, Hibino also does not teach an “alteration means for altering the value of the parameter memorized by said memory means”.

Second, as can be seen from Figs. 9 to 11 and the portions of the reference cited by the Examiner, Hibino does not teach any sort of linking of parameters that belong to a predetermined group of parameters corresponding to an object. Consequently, the apparatus in Hibino, or Barrett for that matter, does not have the advantage of being able to alter the value of a parameter when the value of another parameter linked with the first parameter is altered. Thus Hibino does not teach a “link means for linking, by the unit of a predetermined group, parameters respectively corresponding to the objects and memorized by said memory means” as recited in

claim 1. For this reason, Hibino also does not teach a “control means adapted, in case the value of the parameter is altered by said alteration means, to alter the value of a parameter linked with the altered parameter as a group according to the content of such alteration”. Therefore, Barrett and Hibino, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the claimed invention of claim 1. Claims 2-7 depend on claim 1, and therefore they too are not obvious over Barrett in view of Hibino.

With regard to claims 8 and 15, claim 8 as amended is directed to an information processing method for acquiring various status information of plural peripheral apparatus on a network, comprising among other things, an alteration step of altering the value of a time-out parameter that indicates a time-out time for executing said communication protocol, memorized by a memory for each phenomenon that can be designated in said designation step, and a control step adapted, in case the value of the parameter is altered by said alteration step, to alter the value of a parameter in said memory, linked with said altered parameter as a group according to the content of said alteration. Claim 15 as amended is directed to a computer readable memory storing a computer program to be executed in an information processing apparatus for acquiring various status information of plural peripheral apparatus on a network, said computer program comprising, among other things, an alteration step of altering the value of a time-out parameter that indicates a time-out for executing said communication protocol, memorized by a memory for each phenomenon that can be designated in said designation step, and a control step adapted, in case the value of the parameter is altered by said alteration step, to alter the value of a parameter in said memory, linked with said altered parameter as a group according to the content of said alteration.

As bases for rejecting claims 8 and 15, the Examiner relies on the same reasons

that were cited for the rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, Barrett and Hibino, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the alteration step and control step of claims 8 and 15 for the same reasons that Barrett and Hibino do not disclose or suggest the alteration means and control means of claim 1. Claims 9-14 depend on claim 8 and claims 16-21 depend on claim 15, and therefore they too are not obvious over Barrett in view of Hibino.

With regard to claim 22, the claim as amended is directed to an information processing apparatus comprising, among other things, memory means for memorizing a parameter in said communication protocol for each category as a plurality of groups, said parameter being a number of retries of said request data or a time-out value for the reception of said response data, and control means for reading, from said memory means, the parameter of a category according to the type of the peripheral apparatus designated by said activation means or the information designated by said activation means, and using such parameter in the communication activated by said activation means.

The Examiner states that Barrett does not teach the memory means and the control means of claim 22, but that Hibino does. (May 20, 2004 Office Action at ¶ 6). Applicant, however, respectfully submits that Hibino does not disclose or suggest either of these means. First, even though Hibino discloses a memory ROM 8 for storing various control programs and setting values, the memory in Hibino does not memorize a parameter in a communication protocol for each category as a plurality of groups. Furthermore, the memory in Hibino does not memorize a parameter that is a number of retries or a time-out value for the reception of response data. Therefore, Hibino not teach the memory means recited in claim 22.

Also, the Examiner states that Barrett teaches a parameter for a communication protocol that is a time-out value for the reception of response data, citing Table 3 of Barrett

wherein there is a reference to a “Timeout”. However, as the description in the very same table indicates, Barrett’s “Timeout” refers to “the setting of the job time-out set in the printer.” (Barrett at col. 37, lines 37-39) (emphasis added). Thus Barrett’s Timeout information cannot be the same as the time-out value of claim 22, which pertains to the reception of response data from the peripheral apparatus.

Accordingly, neither Barrett nor Hibino, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests all the elements of claim 22. Claims 23-27 depend on claim 22, and therefore they too are not obvious over Barrett in view of Hibino.

With regard to claims 28 and 34, claim 28 as amended is directed to an information processing method comprising among other things, a readout step of reading a parameter in said communication protocol from memory means storing said parameter for each category as a plurality of groups, said parameter being a number of retries of said request data or a time-out value for the reception of said response data, and a control step of reading, by said readout step, the parameter of a category according to the type of the peripheral apparatus designated by said activation step or the information designated by said activation step, and using such parameter in the communication activated by said activation step. Claim 34 as amended is directed to a computer readable memory storing a computer program to be executed in an information processing apparatus, comprising among other things, a readout step of reading a parameter in said communication protocol from memory means storing said parameter for each category as a plurality of groups, said parameter being a number of retries of said request data or a time-out value for the reception of said response data, and a control step of reading, by said readout step, the parameter of a category according to the type of the peripheral apparatus designated by said activation step or the information designated by said activation step, and using

such parameter in the communication activated by said activation step.

As bases for rejecting claims 28 and 34, the Examiner relies on the same reasons that were cited for the rejection of claim 22. Accordingly, Barrett and Hibino, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the readout step and control step of claims 28 and 34 for the same reasons that Barrett and Hibino do not disclose or suggest the memory means and control means of claim 22. Claims 29-33 depend on claim 28, and therefore they too are not obvious over Barrett in view of Hibino.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that neither Barrett nor Hibino individually or in combination discloses all of the elements of independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 28, and 34 and the claims that depend therefrom.

III. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance is requested. If a conference would assist in placing this application in better condition for allowance, the undersigned would appreciate a telephone call at the number indicated.

Respectfully submitted,
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP



Chris L. Holm
Reg. No.: 39,227

September 20, 2004

Milbank Tweed Hadley & McCloy LLP
1 Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, NY 10005
(212) 530-5000 / (212) 530-5219 (facsimile)